

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **April 5, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller et al. (USPN 6,256,740, hereinafter “Muller”), in view of Jagannathan et al. (USPN 5,692,193, hereinafter “Jagannathan”). Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller in view of Jagannathan, in further view of Taylor, Dave (“Teach Yourself UNIX In A Week”, copyright 1994 by Sams Publishing hereinafter “Taylor”).

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 4-5, 11-12, and 18-19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Muller in view of Jagannathan. Applicant respectfully points out that Jagannathan teaches allocating a TCB from the VP-local pool or the global pool if the returned object is a thread that has no execution context (see Jagannathan, col. 16, lines 12-15). However, Jagannathan **does not teach** the concept of a **provisional identifier** if the global allocator is unavailable or determining if the **global allocator approves** the provisional identifier when the global allocator later becomes available (see Jagannathan, col. 15, line 53 to col. 17, line 50).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to allocating a provisional identifier if the global allocator is unavailable and then determining if the global allocator approves the provisional identifier when the global allocator later becomes available (see FIGs. 5 and 6, page 10, lines 3-6, and page 10, line 20 to page 7, line 19 of the instant application). There is nothing within Muller or Jagannathan, either separately or in concert, which suggests allocating a provisional identifier if the global allocator is unavailable and then determining if

the global allocator approves the provisional identifier when the global allocator later becomes available.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to include the limitations from dependent claims 4-5, 11-12, and 18-19, respectively to clarify that the present invention allocates a provisional identifier if the global allocator is unavailable and then determines if the global allocator approves the provisional identifier when the global allocator later becomes available. These amendments find support in FIGs. 5 and 6, on page 10, lines 3-6, and on page 10, line 20 to page 7, line 19 of the instant application. Dependent claims 4-5, 11-12, and 18-19 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-10 and 14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 16-17 and 21, which depend upon claim 15 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

## CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: April 30, 2004

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665